



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/652,846	08/29/2003	Timothy J. O'Brien	D6020CIP4	5440
7590 Benjamin Aaron Adler ADLER & ASSOCIATES 8011 Candle Lane Houston, TX 77071			EXAMINER HUYNH, PHUONG N	
			ART UNIT 1644	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 12/01/2009	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES

Ex parte TIMOTHY J. O'BRIEN, LOWELL J. UNDERWOOD,
JOHN BEARD, and KAZUSHI SHIGEMASA

Appeal 2009-013515
Application 10/652,846
Technology Center 1600

Decided: December 1, 2009

Before DONALD E. ADAMS, FRANCISCO C. PRATS, and
STEPHEN WALSH, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

ADAMS, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION ON APPEAL

This appeal under 35 U.S.C. § 134 involves claims 52-55, the only claims pending in this application. We have jurisdiction under 35 U.S.C. § 6(b).

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

The claims are directed to an isolated DNA. Claim 52 is representative:

52. An isolated DNA that differs from nucleic acid sequence of SEQ ID NO: 6 due to inclusion of an intron sequence between exon 2 and exon 3 of SEQ ID NO: 6, said DNA encoding a TADG-14 protein variant with an amino acid sequence shown in SEQ ID NO: 75.

Claims 53-55 depend directly or indirectly from claim 52.

The Examiner relies on the following evidence:

Mitsui et al., *A novel form of human neuropsin, a brain-related serine protease, is generated by alternative splicing and is expressed preferentially in human adult brain*, 260 EUR. J. BIOCHEM. 627-34 (1999).

The rejection presented by the Examiner follows:

Claims 52-55 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Mitsui.

We reverse.

ISSUE

Have Appellants established that Mitsui does not teach a DNA sequence that differs from SEQ ID NO: 6 due to the inclusion of an intron sequence between exon 2 and exon 3 are required by Appellants' claim 52?

FINDINGS OF FACT

FF 1. The sequence of Appellants' SEO ID NO: 6 is reproduced below:

ctgtatgcagg	cagagctctac	caagctctctc	cgactctcaa	tggaaagaat	accttatgaa	120
tgtaaagatt	tgggggttca	tggctgttga	ttacacagat	gtaaatgaa	ccatctagat	160
ggatattatag	gtaatccttc	tatgtgtatt	tcaatcatcat	caagcagaag	aggctccagt	180
gtcaaggtatg	ctcagctctt	acagagatata	aaacacgtca	tactgtgag	aaaaaaacta	240
gattctgagtg	atggaaatgt	aagcaaatct	ttcaaaatac	gtagacattc	cttggacata	300
aaacacagat	gaggaagaagg	cttcaaaata	gaagttagct	aataccattc	agaaagttca	360
tgtcttgtaa	attctcttaac	tagaaataat	ggaaattctag	tatgatcttt	gattcccaat	420
taccatttgc	tcagtgggaa	aactaaggta	ctccaaagag	caaatctagg	gagtagaggt	480
ttctcaggga	gcctctgatt	ctgggaagacc	tccaccatgg	acgcgcccca	ctctgtggcg	540
ccaagagagt	gatgttcttg	ctcttctggt	ggggagcctg	gcaggagacc	tccaggggcac	600
aggagagcca	gggtctcgggg	gggtcatgagt	gccaaatggg	ttcgacagct	gtgcaggcgg	660
ctctgttgtaa	gggtccagaaa	ctactctgtg	cgcggtctct	tgtaggtggc	aactggggtc	720
ttacagctgt	ccactgtaaa	aaacccgaat	acacagtttc	ctctggagac	ccacgcctac	780
agaaataaga	tggcccgagat	caagaaatac	ctgtggttca	gtccatccca	caacctctgt	840
acacacagag	cgatgtggag	gaccacaacc	atgatctgat	gctctcttca	ctcggtgacc	900
ggagagagag	ggggctccaa	gtgaagccca	tcagctctggc	agattctatc	accagcctg	960
ggcagagagc	ctgtgtggga	ctgtgtggga	ctgtcacagg	gaagctgtgag	gaattttctg	1020
acactctcat	ctgtgcagaa	gtgtgtgtgc	gagctccagaa	gaagtgggct	gcacagctgc	1080
cgggcgacag	cagatagggc	ttgtgtgtgt	caggctgggg	ccagagtgag	gggtgggggg	1140
aggcgatcat	tggagagccc	cttgtgtgtg	atgtgtcact	ccagagtgag	gggtgggggg	1200
gtgcacacc	ctgtggggag	tcgcgcaaac	ctgtgcgtca	taccacatc	tgcgcctact	1260
tggactgaat	caagaagatc	ataggcagca	agggtctgatt	ctaggataag	cactagatct	1320
cccttaataa	actcacaact	ctctgaaaaa	aaagaaagaa			1360

(See Appellants' Sequence Listing submitted August 29, 2003.)

FF 2. The Examiner finds that figures 2 and 4A of Mitsui teach a DNA that encodes a protein having the amino acid sequence shown in SEQ ID NO: 75 and includes an intron between exon 2 and exon 3 (Ans. 3).

FF 3. The nucleic acid and amino acid sequences illustrated in Mitsui's Figure 2 are reproduced below:

[illegible]

parte Yamaguchi, 88 USPQ2d 1606, 1608 and 1614 (BPAI 2008) (precedential).

“A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” *Verdegaal Bros., Inc. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

ANALYSIS

Claim 52 is drawn to an isolated DNA. The claimed DNA encodes a TADG-14 protein variant with an amino acid sequence shown in SEQ ID NO: 75 (Claim 52).

We are not persuaded by the Examiner’s assertion that Appellants’ “claim 52 recites an isolated DNA that *differs* from nucleic acid sequence of SEQ ID NO: 6, not an isolated DNA sequence comprising the nucleotide sequence as set forth in SEQ ID NO: 6” (Ans. 4). Claim 52 requires the claimed DNA to differ from the nucleic acid sequence of SEQ ID NO: 6 *only* by (i.e., “due to”) including an intron sequence between exon 2 and exon 3 of SEQ ID NO: 6 (Claim 52).

While claim 52 does not require the intron to have a specific sequence, claim 52 does require the presence of all the nucleotides present in SEQ ID NO: 6 arranged in the same order, but for the inclusion of an intron between exon 2 and exon 3 (Claim 52).

SEQ ID NO: 6 has a defined arrangement of nucleotides (*see* FF 1). The claim requires that the arrangement of nucleotides set forth in SEQ ID NO: 6 be modified only by the inclusion of an intron sequence between exon 2 and exon 3. The Examiner has not identified, and we do not find, a

teaching in Mitsui of a sequence that differs from the sequence set forth in SEQ ID NO: 6 only by the inclusion of an intron sequence between exon 2 and exon 3 (*see also* App. Br. 9 (Mitsui does “not teach the DNA sequence that differs from SEQ ID NO:6 due to the inclusion of an intron sequence between exon 2 and exon 3 as recited in Applicants’ claim 52”)).

We recognize the Examiner’s assertion that “the nucleic acid sequence of Mitsui encodes a protein with an amino acid sequence 100% identical to the claimed sequence shown in [Appellants’] SEQ ID NO: 75” (Ans. 4). While this may be true, the claim is not directed to an amino acid sequence, but instead is drawn to a specific nucleotide sequence (Claim 52).

“A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d at 631. Accordingly, the Examiner had the burden of establishing that Mitsui’s nucleotide sequence is the same as Appellants’ claimed DNA. The Examiner has not met this burden on this record.

CONCLUSION OF LAW

Appellants have established that Mitsui does not teach a DNA sequence that differs from SEQ ID NO: 6 due to the inclusion of an intron sequence between exon 2 and exon 3 are required by Appellants’ claim 52. The rejection of claims 52-55 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Mitsui is reversed.

REVERSED

Appeal 2009-013515
Application10/652,846

cdc

BENJAMIN AARON ADLER
ADLER & ASSOCIATES
8011 CANDLE LANE
HOUSTON TX 77071